

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10, 12-19, 21-23, and 25-28 will remain pending in this application. Claims 3, 6, 8-9, 11, 20, and 24 were previously canceled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. The matter added to claims 1, 13, and 18 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraph [0020].

Claims 1-2, 4, 13-14, 18-19, 21-22, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over “The structuring of a wireless internet application for a music-on-demand service on UMTS devices,” March 2002, ACM Press (“Roccetti et al.”) in view of “m-Links: An Infrastructure for Very Small Internet Devices,” July 2001, ACM Press, pages 122-131 (“Schilit et al.”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0126088 (“Mineyama et al.”). Claims 5, 7, 15-16, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,715 (“Langseth”). Claims 12, 17, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. and further in view of “iMobile EE: an enterprise mobile service platform,” July 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Volume 9, Issue 4 (“Y. Chen”). Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 13-14, 18-19, 21-22, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and further in view of Mineyama et al. As per claim 1, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Roccetti et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed, but is silent as to the limitations regarding the fax server and sending destination information to the fax server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices not including the web-enabled device that are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content. Schilit et al. is understood as having been cited as disclosing some of these limitations.

Roccetti et al. and Schilit et al. are acknowledged as being silent as to the limitations regarding “authenticating the web-enabled device, prior to generating the list” and “providing the list to the web-enabled device, the list including only content that is accessible to the authenticated web-enabled device from all the content available at the fax server.”

Mineyama et al. is understood as having been cited as disclosing these limitations.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 has been amend to recite the further limitation “the list including only content that is accessible to the authenticated web-enabled device and that was stored at the storage by the user or by an associate of the user from all the content available at the fax server.” This limitation is supported in the Specification at least at paragraph [0020] (“The content was desirably initially stored in storage 322 by the user or his associates.”).

By contrast, in the system architecture disclosed in Roccetti et al., it appears that the content is not stored at the storage by the user or by an associate of the user. Rather, the mobile client in Roccetti et al. must search for the MP3 files over the Internet, implying that the mobile client has no *a priori* knowledge of where the MP3 files are located and therefore cannot have stored the MP3 files itself. Indeed, section 2.1 at page 1068 of Roccetti et al. expressly states that “the Mobile Client application cannot autonomously determine which Mp3 file [*sic*] are precisely available, and where they are located.”

Moreover, claim 1 recites that the list of content includes “only content . . . that was stored at the storage” The term “the storage” refers to “a storage associated with a fax server.” Accordingly, in the method of claim 1, the content is stored at a storage that is associated with a fax server. By contrast, in the system architecture disclosed in Roccetti et al., the content is not stored at any one location, but rather is distributed across a number of web servers.

For at least these reasons, Roccetti et al. fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, either individually or in combination with the other cited references. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 13 has been amended in similar fashion as claim 1. Accordingly, the above remarks concerning claim 1 apply equally to claim 13, which is also patentable over Roccetti

et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and is also patentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 18 has been amended in similar fashion as claim 1. Accordingly, the above remarks concerning claim 1 apply equally to claim 18, which is also patentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. Claims 19, 21-22, and 26-28 depend from claim 18 and are also patentable over Roccetti et al. in view of Schilit et al. and Mineyama et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

In view of the above, it is believed that claims 1-2, 4, 13-14, 18-19, 21-22, and 26-28 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 5, 7, 10, 12, 15-17, 23, and 25 are also believed to be in condition for allowance given that they add further limitations to their corresponding independent claims.

Based at least on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and requests reconsideration and removal of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

DOCKET NO.: 302767.1 / MSFT-2571
Application No.: 10/692,435
Office Action Dated: November 14, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: February 17, 2009

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439